FIVE CENTS

The Suffragist

WEEKLY ORGAN OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

JANUARY 15, 1916

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
PERIODICAL DIVISION
JAN 19 1916

1916
The Suffragist's Leap-Year

Vol. IV JANUARY 15, 1916 No. 3

The Suffragist

Weekly Organ of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

1420 F Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

Art Editor . . . . MRS. NINA E. ALLENDER

Chairman Circulation Department, MRS. W. T. BURCH

Subscription Price:

Domestic.....$1.00

Foreign.....$1.50

Single Copies.....5 *cents*

Checks, drafts and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Treasurer of the Congressional Union

National Capital Press, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Postoffice at Washington, D. C., under act of March 3, 1879

Notes of the Week

Women's Peace Party Pass Suffrage Resolution

THE Woman's Peace Party, which opened its first annual convention in Washington, January 9, among other resolutions passed one which provided that "effective suffrage legislation" be urged upon Congress at its present session. It will be remembered that the suffrage plank in the peace party platform declares for "the further humanizing of governments by the extension of the franchise to women."

Convention of Women's Democratic League

THE Women's National Democratic League meeting last week in Washington resolved to support President Wilson for next President of the United States and to go actively into a campaign on his behalf. The members of the league have determined to organize in doubtful states; get speakers, hire automobiles to bring Democratic voters to the polls, and run card parties to defray the expenses of part of the campaign.

The league is officered by wives of prominent Democratic office holders. Its membership is at present small, and is likely to remain small until women are enfranchised.

Very few women are willing to run card parties to raise money to bring voters to the polls for any party until that party is willing to recognize them as free citizens in their country.

Suffrage Amendment Introduced in New York Legislature

THE Washington *Times*, of January 11, says that the equal suffrage amendment has been introduced in both Houses of the New York Legislature. Lobbyists for the State Woman Suffrage Party claim that they have received promises of support for the bill from a majority of both Houses.

Un-American Citizens

FEDERAL and state investigations into the recent mob violence at Youngstown, Ohio, in which two persons were killed, many wounded and more than $1,000,000 worth of property destroyed, have disclosed the fact that the rioting was instigated by foreigners and foreign-born citizens of the United States, who were paid to foment labor troubles in the munitions factories.

It is also generally believed that the explosion at the Dupont powder mills last Saturday, in which forty-two lives were lost, was planned and carried out by men who placed the interests of a foreign government before our own. Federal authorities are now investigating this last act of violence.

The President of the United States in his message to Congress on December 6 referred with considerable bitterness to this new problem in our national life. "There are citizens of the United States, I blush to admit," he said, "born under other flags, but welcomed under our generous naturalization laws to the full freedom and opportunity of America, who have poured the poison of disloyalty into the very arteries of our national life; who have sought to bring the freedom and good name of our government into contempt; to destroy our industries wherever they thought effective for their vindictive purposes to strike at them, and to debase our politics to the uses of foreign intrigue."

Meanwhile the President makes no move to admit to the full freedom and opportunity of America the women of his country.

It will be difficult for future times to understand the generosity with which the gift of freedom was extended to men of all classes, types and races, and the obstinacy with which it was refused to American women, connected by the closest ties of loyalty to every institution of their native land.

Citizenship Appeals Made in Pay Envelopes

"You Live in America."
"You Work in America."
"Why Not Be a Part of America?"
"Citizenship Makes You a Part of America."

INTO the pay envelopes of hundreds of thousands of working men of Pennsylvania this reminder that America must be first is being placed, at the request of the State Department of Labor at Harrisburg.

Heads of all the big corporations employing labor have been requested by Commissioner Jackson to utilize the series of twelve "Better Citizenship" leaflets that have been published by the National Americanization Committee in helping along the crusade against "hyphenated Americanism."

"Cooperation of all those working for true American ideals" in forwarding this work is called for by the committee.

Women do not criticise these efforts. But they are astonished that no one inquires into the "fitness" of foreign men to become citizens and voters, or insists upon knowing what they will do with the vote to correct evils caused by the existing electorate.

The "true American ideals," which must be taught the alien, become sadly confused when the very principle of democracy is denied in America in the case of women.

Citizenship for Men and Women

CITIZENSHIP is not only freely accorded to men; it is very carefully guarded for them.

Secretary of Labor Wilson outlined in a letter dated January 8, and sent to Representative Patten, of New York, the ruling of the Bureau of Immigration that Americans who enlist under a qualified oath of allegiance in the fighting forces of foreign powers, shall not be regarded upon application for readmission to the United States as having lost their American citizenship because of such enlistment.

Yet the American woman who marries a foreigner and continues to reside in the land where she was born loses her citizenship in this country.

Married School Teacher Wins Her Case

THE Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on January 6 handed down a decision declaring that women school teachers of the District of Columbia might marry and still retain their positions.

The decision occurred in the case of Mrs. Gladys Hellman, who was forced by the Board of Education to vacate her position following her marriage on June 15 of last year.

Women Engineer to Sue Civil Engineers

THERE are now no women members in the American Society of Civil Engineers. Mrs. Nora Blatch de Forest, who was the only one, has prepared to bring suit against the society for ousting her. Mrs. de Forest, a granddaughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and a daughter of Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, was a junior member and applied for promotion, but the members voted down her application. At the age of 31, junior members cease to be members. Mrs. de Forest, who is a civil engineer and a suffragist, declares that the action was taken solely because she is a woman, and that no legitimate reasons were advanced to explain the move.

Suffrage on Board the Ford Peace Ship

"THE suffrage poll of the Ford Peace Ship showed 132 to 11 in favor of votes for women," writes Mrs. Alice Park from Norway, on December 18. "Women were 57 to 1. Men were 73 to 10. The few negatives were most apologetic and explanatory. They asked if their names were to be made public and seemed relieved when told that only the final count was to be published. No such nervous fear was shown by those who said 'Yes.'

"When the revised list of passengers was published, many names were joined with the word 'suffragist' to indicate much more than a passive acceptance of the principle of sex equality. It was rather a title indicating active work in the organized movement for votes for women.

"Never have I seen such perfect equality between men and women as on the Ford Peace Ship. In meetings, in platform privileges, formal debate and informal discussion, men and women meet as absolute equals. It might well be a western ship sailing along the Pacific Coast instead of a company gathered from suffrage and non-suffrage states, from walks of life including business, press and education."

German Suffragists Petition Reichstag

IN GERMANY, we learn from *Jus Suffragii*, the Frauenstimmrechtsbund (Women's Suffrage Union) recently sent a petition to the Reichstag, signed by Anita Augspurg and Lida Gustava Heymann, asking that after the war women may be politically enfranchised on an equality with men. The petition declines to bring forward arguments for woman suffrage, which "have been presented to the Government and Parliament for decades," but lays more weight on the additional reasons which will be afforded by the period after the war for "using to the full for the good of the State all available forces," an end that will only be attained by giving the vote to all citizens of adult age.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn

Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York

SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

Representative Carew of New York Interviewed by Suffragists

"WE DO NOT have government by the people. We have representative government," said John F. Carew, Congressman from the fourteenth district of New York, to a deputation of women from the Congressional Union.

Mr. Carew received the deputation, numbering about fifty women, at the Osceola Democratic Club, on Monday afternoon, January 2, at half past five. Mr. Carew was precisely punctual, entering the reception room on the stroke of the clock and taking his stand in a corner of the room. Later he suggested that he was figuratively as well as literally "in a corner."

Miss Minnie Friedman, who is the temporary chairman of the district, arranged the deputation. Mrs. John Winters Brannan was the spokesman. Knowing Mr. Carew's previous hostility to the principle of woman suffrage, the spokesman was not only exquisitely courteous, but most conciliatory.

Mr. Carew reasserted his opposition to the enfranchisement of women.

"I voted against the proposition in the House of Representatives last year, and also on election day in New York. But in my present attitude I do not seek refuge in the fact that my state turned it down, or that my district voted against it. If I were convinced that we would have a better government with women voting, I would favor it. But I don't think we would have a better government; I don't think we would have as good, if all women had a vote, as we have today. Look at the states which have suffrage. The government of no state, suffrage or not, is better than New York state.

"We do not have government by the people. We have representative government. I represent every woman, and every child, in my district, just as much as every man.

"I am not guided in my position on public questions by the number of right hands raised for it, or the number of left hands raised against it in my district. This country or this state is governed on the committee plan, like a club—this club, for example."

At this point Mrs. Evan Evans inquired if it were not true that each member in that club had a vote. But Mr. Carew did not let that interfere with the logical course of his remarks.

"I do not regard this denial of the vote to women as an injustice," continued Mr. Carew. "The few remaining injustices to women in the law go back into history, handed down by the common law, and were not injustices at the time. There isn't an injustice that affects women that I won't do everything in my power to remove."

Mrs. John Sherwin Crosby, who was once appointed deputy sheriff, but was not permitted to serve because she was a woman, commented on the present discrimination against women as eligible for many kind of offices affording remunerative livelihood. Mrs. Crosby is president and founder of the Women's Democratic Club of New York.

Mr. Carew said that he held office at a salary of $7,500 a year as Representative in Congress only at great sacrifice to himself, losing more than that by absence from his business.

"I see too many things in the suffrage states which make government contemptible—Colorado, for example." Then the Congressman entered upon a discussion of England's present war policies, and deplored the efforts of the English people to influence their officials.

A number of women, resenting many of Mr. Carew's remarks, spoke out in protest. It was suggested that if he gave further thought to the question of suffrage he might modify his objections.

Feelingly, Mr. Carew replied, "Do you suppose that I haven't been thinking of it for the last six months?"

After hearing the spokesman, Mr. Carew sought a chair and made his own remarks seated; the ladies also were provided with seats later.

The deputation left, determined to persuade Mr. Carew that a Congressman must be guided by the organized opinion of his district.

Senator Pomerene of Ohio Asked to Vote for Suffrage

UNDER the leadership of Miss Lucile Atcherson and Dr. Alice M. Johnston, a deputation of suffragists again interviewed Senator Pomerene.

The women assembled at suffrage headquarters, 60 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, at nine o'clock Friday morning, January 7, and marched by appointment to that mecca for politicians, the historic Neil House. The suffragists were then escorted through the parlors, filled with anxious aspirants for postoffice appointments and their friends, to the Senator's room.

After the members of the deputation had been introduced to the Senator, Mrs. William McPherson, congressional chairman, introduced Mrs. Edward Orton, Jr., a national officer of the D. A. R., who gave a brief review of the growth of suffrage sentiment in the state. She called his attention to the fact that within two years there was a gain of five thousand votes for suffrage in the county and eighty-five thousand votes in the state. "And Ohio is but as the rest of the country. It is a national question and the time is ripe for a national amendment."

Next came Mrs. Charles Adler, as student of political economy at the Ohio State University, who refuted the states' rights objection to the amendment. "You believe, do you not, that suffrage is a question for the states to decide?" said Mrs. Adler. "Let the Susan B. Anthony amendment aid them to settle it. Congress does not amend the United States Constitution. It simply passes the amendment in order to refer it to the state legislatures."

Miss Lucile Atcherson, treasurer of the Ohio Branch of the Congressional Union, called the Senator's attention to the political aspects of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and she pointed out that the strength of the suffragists was more than 6,500,000 in 21 different states, including 4,500,000 in suffrage states, and 3,000,000 male voters in 11 non-suffrage states where elections have been held on the question.

In reply to the deputation, Senator Pomerene denied that equal suffrage had become a question for the federal government to decide. He insisted that it should be settled, state by state. It would not be right, he declared, to force it upon states that did not want it.

In taking their leave, the members of the deputation thanked the Senator for the courtesy of the interview. There were present Mrs. Myron Seibert, Mrs. C. R. Galbreath, Mrs. Harry Bradbury, Mrs. George D. Jones, Miss Lila McDonald, Mrs. Stella Krumm Seton, Mrs. Karl Hasbrook, Mrs. F. C. Kelton, Miss Anna H. Quinby, Mrs. William McPherson, Mrs. George U. Marvin, Miss Lucile Atcherson, Mrs. Edward Orton, Jr., and Dr. Alice M. Johnston.

Comments of the Press

Suffrage in the Senate

THE Committee on Suffrage of the United States Senate has reported favorably the resolution to amend the Constitution so that all women may vote. Regardless of what one may think of woman's suffrage, the action referred to represents a distinct victory for the advocates of "votes for women."

Despite the very eloquent and chivalrous statement issued by the distinguished Senators to justify their favorable report, the impression must persist that political expedience, as well as abstract logic, assisted in framing their conclusion. A presidential election will be held this year, and, with woman's suffrage already established in eleven states, enough women will vote next November to decide the outcome, should they go to the polls as women, in a close contest.

There is a majority of states where the opinion of most male voters is unquestionably opposed to extending the franchise to women. It is likewise true that in those states the women are themselves, for the most part, indifferent to the issue. But, with the power already in their hands, the advocates of suffrage from the eleven suffrage states are clearly able to bring great pressure to bear upon statesmen whose desire for personal and party victory is stronger than their dislike for woman's suffrage.

The action of the Senate Committee on Suffrage supports an oft-repeated statement that the year 1916 would find many men in public life making a special effort to win the good will of the hundreds of thousands of women who will participate in electing the next President of the United States.—*Philadelphia Evening Telegraph*, January 10, 1916.

The Tyranny of Phrases

By Matilda Hall Gardner

WOMEN who have enjoyed the experience of interviewing many of our national legislators on the subject of the national suffrage amendment have marvelled at the sameness of the form of reply. The woman who is asking for social and economic justice through the medium of federal enfranchisement is answered by the phrase: "I am a state rights man," or "I believe in states' rights." Other descriptive phrases may follow relating to the sacredness of the state, but seldom any constructive argument. Some critics have blamed this limitation of thought to tradition; but a member of the House of Representatives has recently explained this extraordinary sameness of phraseology in referring to it as "the tyranny of phrases."

On January 7, the House was considering H. R. No. 408, a bill providing for the development of water power on public lands. The Hon. Swager Sherley, from the Fifth Congressional District in Kentucky, in speaking for the bill, concluded his remarks in part by saying, "I want to say, in conclusion, another thing. I am sometimes impressed by the tyranny of phrases. Men bow down before the idol of a cant phrase. I came here thirteen years ago a very pronounced believer in state rights. I have not lost my conviction touching real state rights, but I am constantly reminded of the fact that we are all the time hearing more of state rights than we are of state duties."

It is to be hoped that Mr. Sherley's gentle admonition to his fellow legislators will be heeded. If the duties of the state were considered rather than the "rights" of the states the enfranchisement of women would follow inevitably.

Five Kinds
Ten Cents
Half
Pound

CORBY CAKE IS READY TO SERVE

IT GOES TO YOUR DEALER FRESH FROM OUR OVENS THREE TIMES DAILY

Rich and Dainty, and Like Corby Bread—ABSOLUTELY PURE

Raisin
Plain
Chocolate
Lady
Marble

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Miss Alice Paul, N. J., Chairman
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y., Vice-Chairman
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. John Winters Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Miss Elsie Hill, Conn.
Mrs. Donald R. Hooker, Md.
Mrs. William Kent, Cal.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Pa.
Miss Anne Martin, Nev.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mrs. Nina E. Allender, D. C.
Mrs. W. D. Ascough, Conn.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. John Winters Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Edward Breitung, Mich.
Mrs. Margaret Zane Cherdron, Utah
Miss Cornelia Cook, Ore.
Miss Olive M. Elrich, Conn.
Mrs. J. Borden Estee, Vt.
Mrs. Bertha W. Fowler, Col.
Mrs. John Gibbs, S. C.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. J. A. H. Hopkins, N. J.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. Harry Lowenburg, Pa.
Miss Anne Martin, Nev.
Mrs. Cyrus Mead, Ohio
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
Mrs. Alden H. Potter, Minn.
Mrs. Townsend Scott, Md.
Mrs. W. E. Stanrod, Idaho
Mrs. Robert Treat Whitehouse, Me.
Mrs. Robert Adamson, N. Y.
Miss Jessie Ashley, N. Y.
Mrs Mary Austin, Cal.
Miss Harriet Bain, Wis.
Mrs. Adolphus Clay Bartlett, Ill.
Mrs. Mary Ritter Beard, N. Y.
Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissevain, N. Y.
Mrs. Alfred H. Bright, Minn.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. Henry Bruere, N. Y.
Miss Mary A. Burnham, Pa.
Mrs. Dora Phelps Buell, Col.
Mrs. Annie Wells Cannon, Utah
Mrs. Lillian Harris Coffin, Cal.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. T. T. Cotnam, Ark.
Mrs. Lucius M. Cuthbert, Col.
Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.
Mrs. John Dewey, N. Y.
Miss Lavinia Dock, N. Y.
Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr, N. Y.
Mrs. O. F. Ellington, Ark.
Mrs. J. André Fouilhoux, Ore.
Mrs. Glendower Evans, Mass.
Mrs. E. F. Feickert, N. J.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Miss Susan P. Frost, So. Car.
Mrs. Emma Maddox Funck, Md.
Mrs. Harvey C. Garber, Ohio
Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Haynes Gilmore, Cal.
Mrs. Adolphus E. Graupner, Cal.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. Jennie Law Hardy, Mich.
Mrs. W. E. Hardy, Neb.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. Phoebe A. Hearst, Cal.
Mrs. George Hendrie, Mich.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Miss Ada L. James, Wis.
Mrs. Agnes M. Jenks, R. I.
Miss Helen Keller, Mass.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Mrs. William Bross Lloyd, Ill.
Mrs. Jessie Hardy MacKaye, D. C.
Mrs. Ida Finney Mackrille, Cal.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.
Miss Julia Marlowe, N. Y.
Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn.
Mrs. John T. Morrison, Idaho
Mrs. Ellen Spencer Mussey, D. C.
Mrs. Meredith Nicholson, Ind.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Annie Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. William Prendergast, N. Y.
Mrs. Nina E. Proctor N. Y.
Mrs. Henry Ridgly, Del.
Miss Margaret Roberts, Idaho
Mrs. John Rogers, N. Y.
Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, N. Y.
Mrs. Frederick Sanborn, Cal.
Mrs. May Wright Sewall, Ind.
Mrs. Austin Sperry, Cal.
Mrs. Julius Stone, Ohio
Mrs. Mary C. Therkelsen, Ore.
Mrs. Robert Gibbes Thomas, S. C.
Miss Clara L. Thompson, Mo.
Mrs. Richard Wainwright, D. C.
Mrs. Hettie D. M. Wallis, Tex.
Mrs. Thomas F. Walsh, D. C.
Mrs. Elizabeth Lowe Watson, Cal.
Mrs. Mina Van Winkle, N. J.
Mrs. John Jay White, D. C.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Dr. Marian Walker Williams, Ariz.
Miss Bird Wilson, Nev.
Mrs. S. B. M. Young, Mont.
Miss Maud Younger, Cal.

The Susan B. Anthony Amendment

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE.—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Drafted

In its present form, by Susan B. Anthony in 1875.

Reported from Committee,

In the Senate,

1878, Adverse majority.
1879, Favorable minority.
1882, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1884, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1886, Favorable majority.
1890, Favorable majority.
1892, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1896, Adverse majority.
1913, Favorable majority.
1914, Favorable majority.

In the House,

1883, Favorable majority.
1884, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1886, Favorable minority.
1890, Favorable majority.
1894, Adverse majority.
1914, Without recommendation.

Voted Upon

In the Senate,

January 25, 1887. Yeas 16, nays 34. Absent 26 (of whom 4 were announced as for, and 2 against).

March 19, 1914. Yeas 35, nays 34, failing by 11 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

In the House,

January 12, 1915. Yeas 174, nays 204 failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

The Senate Report

THE favorable report of the Susan B. Anthony amendment from the Senate Woman Suffrage Committee shows that in the Senate woman suffrage has passed through the breakers of politics and is now riding the high seas. The report was presented just six legislative days after the hearing on the suffrage amendment by an overwhelming majority of the committee which had it under consideration.

At the beginning of the Sixty-third Congress suffragists had no small difficulty in securing an early date for a hearing on their measure, so unreasonable was it thought to be that Congress, which had come together to reform the tariff and enact a currency measure, should spend its time in considering such an abstract subject as national woman suffrage. Women were even warned at the time that they would "hurt their cause" and "alienate sympathy" if they asked for action on suffrage at a time when Senators were deep in the study of "important questions like the tariff."

Before the Sixty-third Congress, no favorable report of the Susan B. Anthony amendment had been made for twenty-one years, although the amendment was introduced into every Congress and suffragists had appeared punctually before Senate committees asking that their bill be given consideration.

The resistance to woman suffrage in the national field is plainly breaking down.

Philippine Independence

THE Philippine independence bill is being pushed vigorously in the Senate and is, of course, eliciting from Senators of all parties expressions of undeviating loyalty to the principles of democracy upon which our government is based.

Senator Shafroth, of Colorado, who introduced the bill, is a representative of women voters and a suffragist; he can without inconsistency defend the necessity for extending a greater power of self-government to the Filipinos. Nevertheless, it is only for the Filipino man that Senator Shafroth is pleading. His party in the House defeated three successive proposals looking toward the enfranchisement of Filipino women—to confer the rights granted to Filipino men upon Filipino women; to confer these rights upon tax-paying Filipino women; or finally, to give to Filipino men the right to enfranchise Filipino women if they wished to do so. All three amendments were defeated by an almost solid party vote.

But the patience of women is still more sorely tried when Senator Williams, of Mississippi, who voted against the suffrage amendment, demands freedom for the Filipino man.

"The Senator from South Dakota," says Mr. Williams, "says that the Filipino now has a 'measurable amount of self-government' or a 'measurable power of self-government.' Yes, it is 'measurable;' and it is measured; and what is worse is, that it is 'measured' by the other fellow. That was just exactly what was the matter with our ancestors when they undertook to fight the war of the Revolution. . . .

"One thing that every man who is a citizen of a free country must learn is that the limitation on the capacity of a free country is this, that a free democracy cannot govern a dependent people without the right of self-government. You cannot keep your cake and eat your cake. You can do one of three things. You can let these people go, and in that way preserve yourself against the reaction in your own mind against your democratic institutions; or you may embody them as part and parcel of the body politic. The third thing is to keep them as you choose and govern them like British crown colonies, or as King George dreamed he could govern us. If you attempt to govern them in that way you train army officers, navy officers, and civilian officers to a contempt of free institutions. . . .

"I know that the Filipino would be happier even with bad government of his own than he will be with good government of mine or yours. I may not be as wise, nor as smart, nor as great, nor as good a man as the Senator from California, but I will be lots happier and better satisfied if I am allowed to control my own individual conduct than I would be if he controlled it for me and controlled it twenty times as well. . . .

"Why, Mr. President, sometimes when a man who has from his boyhood studied and loved history, casts his eyes over the chronicle of recent events, he becomes hopeless and pessimistic. Are mankind condemned forever to repeat the errors of their ancestors, or of somebody else's ancestors? Will mankind never learn that God loves freedom more than he loves anything else in the world, and honors it more, as is proven by the fact that He leaves you and me free to go wrong if we choose, when He could have kept us as perfect, angelic angels—flabby angels, it is true—in the Garden of Eden forever, if He had wanted to? Will man never learn that you cannot gain physical strength except by the exercise of your physical muscles, and that you never can gain moral strength except by the exercise of your moral muscles, and that you can never gain political strength, the capacity for self-government, except by exercising the art of self-government? . . ."

Will man never learn, we ask the honorable gentlemen, to apply to woman the principles he applies to himself?

Senate Committee Reports Suffrage Amendment Favorably

THE woman suffrage bill surprised even its friends by coming out of committee and on to the calendar of the Senate on Saturday, January 8. Senator Thomas, of Colorado, chairman of the woman suffrage committee, reported Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, which was introduced by Senator Sutherland. The bill therefore will be known as the Sutherland bill.

In the report which he submitted with the bill, Senator Thomas declared that Congress owed it to the women of the nation to pass the measure, and prophesied that the states would ratify it upon its submission. The concluding words of his report were, "The power of Congress to propose this amendment is obvious. Its affirmative exercise upon the proposed amendment is in our opinion due to the women of the nation who desire the suffrage. Moreover, it is in conformity with justice; and it is our confident opinion that its submission by Congress will be followed by its ratification."

The members of the Senate suffrage committee who signed the report are Senators Thomas, of Colorado, chairman; Owen, of Oklahoma; Ransdell, of Louisiana; Hollis, of New Hampshire; Jones, of Washington; Sutherland, of Utah, and Clapp, of Minnesota. Senators Johnson, of South Dakota, and Catron, of New Mexico, refused to sign.

The amendment was introduced by Senator Sutherland on December 7, the day after Congress convened. Hearings on the measure took place on December 15 and 16. On December 17 the Senate recessed until Tuesday, January 4. On Saturday of the same week the woman suffrage committee made their favorable report.

To have the bill brought forward so early in the session, without anxious effort on the part of suffragists, marks a splendid change in the political situation of their movement.

Miss Anne Martin, of Nevada, who is in charge of the legislative work of the Union, expressed her appreciation of the generous courtesy of Senator Thomas in giving the name of Senator Sutherland, who had introduced the measure for the Union, to the bill, when he himself had introduced the same bill at the request of the National Association.

SENATOR THOMAS' report says in part:

"Every enlargement of the franchise has been a natural and logical development of the principle of popular sovereignty. To admit the doctrine that the people are the source of all power is to recognize the right of the people to form their government and choose their rulers. Hence all classes and conditions of men have been enfranchised. . . .

"In our opinion, every argument and every principle upon which universal manhood suffrage rests, demands the extension of its privileges and responsibilities to women. . . . So long as the existing status continues, ours is a government of all the people by one-half of the people. Equality of privilege and responsibility must go hand in hand in popular governments, if its principles are to be observed, and its objects accomplished. . . .

"We are not impressed by arguments against equal suffrage based upon difference in sex. They are in this age familiar through much repetition as are those which assert that woman's duties and mission conflict with her use of the ballot. It is sufficient to say that these objections have not materialized in the states where equal suffrage prevails, and this is so clear that any attempt in these states to disfranchise the women would be resisted by the male voters quite as vigorously as would an attack upon their own right. . . .

"And her activities, her participation, her sacrifices and her misfortunes in the great conflict now raging over three continents, have for all time disposed of the contention that she should not be armed with the ballot because she cannot wield the sword. She has taken man's place in all the industrial pursuits of organized society, she has maintained his governments, manufactured his ammunition, observed and enforced his laws, operated his machines, bound up his wounds, buried his dead and has been his comrade in arms upon the firing line. Man has become conscious of her powerful cooperation in war; he will soon recognize the justice of her demand to share his burden in public affairs in times of peace.

Senator Sutherland, of Utah

Whose Bill, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, was Favorably Reported from Committee

"Mr. Sidney Brooks, in a recent magazine article entitled 'The New England,' forecasts the transformations to be wrought by the great war in the political and economic life of Great Britain. He closes his article with this prediction regarding the status of British women in the reconstructed empire of the future:

"'There is one great social and political change which may already be said to be foreordained. The war has done more for women than they could ever have done for themselves, and their full political and professional emancipation in England will prove, I imagine, to be one of its first and best consequences. There were people before the war who said that women could not vote because they could not fight. We all know better now. We all know you cannot wage war without the help of women, and that their zeal and self-sacrifice, and their organizing talents are an essential part of a modern nation's military strength. . . .'

"The expediency of enfranchising women by an amendment to the federal Constitution, or relegating the subject to the states respectively, is fairly debatable. It may be wiser not to interfere with the undoubted right of the states to regulate and control the franchise than to enlarge the authority of the general government over the subject through the agency of a constitutional amendment. But inasmuch as the nation nearly half a century ago determined to restrict state authority over the ballot by abolishing certain disqualifications theretofore prevailing, it seems but appropriate and desirable that it should emphasize the policy by abolishing the disqualification of sex; a disqualification affecting fifty per centum of our population and far less defensible than those enumerated in the fifteenth amendment. It would equalize political conditions throughout the country, negatively at least, thus removing one of the greatest sources of existing popular discontent. Under prevailing circumstances a woman citizen of Colorado enfranchised by its laws, who removes to New Mexico, carries with her all the privileges and immunities of a citizen of Colorado, except the privilege or right to vote. This is divested by her change of domicile; a divesture which no male citizen of the United States suffers through a similar change of domicile. Were this situation reversed, it would long since have engendered resentment ripening into revolt. . . ."

MRS. FLORENCE KELLEY, of New York, who for several years was chairman of the Congressional committee of the National Association, and who was in the gallery when Senator Thomas reported the bill, is enthusiastic over its early appearance.

"The federal amendment for woman suffrage seems this year for the first time to be sure to be referred to the states," Mrs. Kelley said last Saturday.

"The first federal amendment for woman suffrage was introduced by Senator Sargent, of California, in the Senate in 1875, and by my father in the House of Representatives in 1877. But until the Congressional committee under Miss Paul and Miss Burns undertook to get it passed, all the effort made in its behalf was half-hearted and unsuccessful. I was chairman of the committee in the National Association through two Congresses, and never succeeded, as none of my predecessors had ever succeeded, in getting any broad national backing. This year for the first time I am filled with hope that the amendment will pass because at the latest election for the first time, the President of the United States voted for suffrage. And at the next election in November, 1916, four million women will vote for a president and a million men have now expressed their will that women shall vote. No such conjunction as this has ever existed in the history of the republic, and no such nation-wide ably organized effort ever was made before to present to the members of Congress the wishes of their constituents, that this amendment be submitted to the legislatures at this session."

IN the House the situation of the amendment, though less favorable than in the Senate, is very encouraging.

The suffrage bill is now before the Judiciary Committee of which Representative Webb, of North Carolina, is chairman. It has been referred by them as is usual to its sub-committee on constitutional amendments. The members of this sub-committee are Congressman Carlin, of Virginia; chairman; Congressmen Gard, of Ohio, and Taggart, of Kansas, Democrats; Volstead, of Minnesota, and Morgan, of Oklahoma, Republicans.

Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Webb, himself introduced the national prohibition amendment. Thus, according to the expressed opinion of members of the House themselves, he has burned the bridge of the states rights plea behind him. Congressman Carlin, of Virginia, chairman of the sub-committee on constitutional amendments, is also in favor of federal legislation on prohibition. Members of the Union believe it will not be long before action is secured on suffrage in both houses.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.

Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York

SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

Branch of Congressional Union Organized in Massachusetts

THE Massachusetts members of the Congressional Union met in conference at Boston last week, chose their state officers, pledged $500 for work in their state, and drew up a program of activities for the coming year.

The call to the conference to take place on January 7 at the Women's City Club, Beacon Street, was sent out by Mrs. Josephine Preston Peabody Marks and Miss Helen Keller, Massachusetts members of the advisory council.

On the evening of January 6 a public mass meeting was held at the Twentieth Century Club, Boston, with Miss Lucy Burns as the principal speaker. Keenest interest was aroused by the announcement of a public meeting in the interest of the Congressional Union and its work for the Susan B. Anthony amendment; and the hall was filled with representatives of all the various suffrage activities in the state. Mrs. Olive Halladay Hasbrouck presided.

The Reverend William R. Lord, of Dover, made a powerful speech on the advantages of national over state action, and Miss Burns gave an illuminating account of the activities of the Congressional Union in its work for the passage of the Anthony amendment. Her story of the wonderful struggle for suffrage in the last Congress was followed by a very alert audience.

At the conclusion of Miss Burns' address, Mrs. Evelyn Peverley Coe offered the following resolution, which was unanimously and enthusiastically passed:

"Resolved, that this meeting assembled at the Twentieth Century Club, Boston, January 6, 1916, under the auspices of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, calls upon the Sixty-fourth Congress of the United States to pass immediately the Susan B. Anthony amendment enfranchising women, and

"Resolved, that this meeting calls upon the Senators and Representatives of the State of Massachusetts to support this amendment when it comes before their respective bodies for a vote, and be it further

"Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this state urging them to present these resolutions to the Senate and the House to become part of the Congressional Record."

Mrs. Hasbrouck made a most effective collection speech, which resulted in over $300 in pledges and collection and SUFFRAGIST subscriptions for the suffrage education of Massachusetts Senators and Congressmen.

Before the meeting adjourned there was general discussion.

A beautiful azalea was sent to Miss Burns by the Boston florist, William Penn.

On Friday, January 7, a luncheon was given at the Women's City Club, on Beacon Street, the guests of honor being Miss Lucy Burns and Mrs. Josephine Preston Peabody Marks. About sixty guests sat at the tables, which were decorated with flowers in the colors of the Congressional Union.

Agnes H. Morey
Chairman, Massachusetts Congressional Union

Mrs. Agnes H. Morey opened the speaking with a brief introduction of Mrs. Marks, who read very beautifully Olive Schreiner's "Three Dreams in a Desert." Mrs. Morey then introduced Mrs. Thomas H. Gray, Jr., of Brookline, as chairman of the program and conference.

After appointing a committee on constitutions and a nominating committee which withdrew for consultation, Mrs. Gray presented Mrs. Evelyn Peverly Coe, former secretary of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, who spoke on the referendum —its enormous expense in money, time and energy, and of her discouragement until she caught the wonderful vision of the national movement. "So," she naively said, "as far as referendums go, I'm through."

Mrs. Coe was followed by Miss Katherine A. Morey, whose zeal had been fanned into a flame at the convention of the Congressional Union in Washington, and who gave a very interesting account of her experiences there—testifying to the splendid democratic spirit that permeated the convention, to the organized financial and political support of the women voters towards freeing the women of the East, and of the changed and attentive attitude of the President and the Congressional committees. Miss Burns made the principal address.

Miss Doris Stevens, national organizer, completed the program with a brief account of the Woman Voter's Convention and a plea for funds which resulted in an addition of over $227 in pledges and collection.

The committees then reported. A constitution for the Massachusetts branch of the Congressional Union was adopted and the following officers were elected: State chairman, Mrs. Agnes H. Morey; vice-chairmen, Mrs. Olive Halladay Hasbrouck, Mrs. Thomas H. Gray, Jr., Mrs. Edward C. Jeffrey, Mrs. Gertrude B. Newell; secretary, Mrs. Evelyn Peverley Coe; treasurer, Miss Katharine A. Morey.

Among the many new members added to the Union are Miss A. Von Arnim, treasurer of the Brookline Suffrage Association; Mrs. H. L. Bearse, member executive committee of the Brookline Suffrage Association; Miss Margarette B. Krebs, corresponding secretary of the Cambridge Political Equality Association; Mrs. Edward C. Jeffrey, first vice-president of the Cambridge Political Equality Association; Mrs. Frank Waldo, member of board of directors of the Cambridge Political Equality Association; Mrs. John A. Brackett, president of Methuen Suffrage League; Mrs. Grace Anthony MacMichael, officer in the Walden League, whose father was own cousin to Susan B. Anthony; Mrs. Frank Scanlan, vice-chairman of Suffolk County during the campaign; Mrs. James R. Carret, of Cambridge, who worked for the federal amendment in Miss Anthony's time; Mrs. Mathilda H. Geddes, of Brookline, wife of Professor Geddes, of Boston University; Miss Elizabeth Marot, of Worcester; Miss Nancy Flagg, of Annisquam, and Mrs. Mary C. Hall, of Lowell.

The executive committee met on Saturday, January 8, at the Copley Plaza, and instituted plans for a series of brilliant mass meetings. They believe that the work of the new Massachusetts branch of the Congressional Union will be pushed with vigor and enthusiasm.

The Federal Amendment vs. State Rights

By Robert Treat Whitehouse

(*Continued from The Suffragist of January 8, 1916*)

NOW as to the second objection, viz.: that the character, intelligence and capacity of women vary in different states, and that one state, as Wyoming, for example, has no right to impose upon Georgia the enfranchisement of its women, Congressman Stevens, of New Hampshire, replied: "There are no local conditions as to sex. The women of one state are, upon the average, as competent to vote as those of another." And who can demonstrate that this is not substantially true, if against the negro women of the south we offset the ignorant women of the slums in the north, and especially when we consider that the white women of fifteen of the southern states exceed by 494,627 the entire number of negro men and women in those states? Certainly no one would attempt to say that the women of the east would be less competent to exercise the franchise than those of the west. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that the ratification of the Anthony amendment does not take away from any of the states their right to impose any such qualification, educational or otherwise, which they deem necessary as to the exercise of the franchise by women just as they now do in regard to men.

Were it not for the repeated statements by congressmen, for example, Representative Hughes, of Georgia, that one state has no right to impose woman suffrage on another, it would not be necessary to restate the proposition that it is not a case of one state imposing this on another, but of three-fourths of the states imposing it on the other fourth, in exactly the way that the other fourth consented that it should be done when they became states under the constitution, viz.: by lawful amendment of the constitution in the manner therein provided.

The fifteenth amendment was imposed in 1869 by twenty-nine states of the Union upon eight other states. If it was not an un-American or unconstitutional interference with state rights and the inherent jurisdiction of the individual state over suffrage for three-fourths of the states to impose this amendment upon the other fourth in 1869, then by the same token it is not today.

NOW let us accept the challenge thrown down by Congressman Stafford, of Wisconsin, viz.: that the protagonists of the amendment should advance some reason why it is a matter of federal concern instead of purely a state right, and consider the following:

1. Our nation is a Union composed of a federation of states bound together by a contract known as the constitution, which prescribes the terms of their union, and under which each state confers upon the federal government direct control over some of the inherent sovereign powers which it would otherwise possess, and consents in advance to an amendment of this contract in such manner as three-fourths of the other contracting parties shall deem best for the good of the nation. In these days, when we are confronted by an upheaval which shakes the very foundation of civilization, when foreign military aggression is impending, the Monroe doctrine threatened, and national preparedness our chief concern, surely it is the time of all others in the history of our country when a strong federal control, supported and guided by the will of all the citizens (and women are citizens, even under the constitution as it stands) is essential to the welfare of the nation.

2. The enfranchisement of the women of a given state gives them the right to vote not merely on

(*Continued on page 8*)

Organization Work for 1916

A BIG work is to be done in the coming year. The business of systematizing this work is now well in hand.

A new branch of the activities of the Congressional Union at the National Capital is the management of the headquarters at 21 Madison Place. For the first time the Congressional Union has a suitable home, spacious and beautiful, and adequate for its business and social activities. The management of the house is in the hands of a house committee, of which Mrs. Robert Baker is chairman. The members of the committee are: Mrs. Randolph Keith Forrest, acting chairman in Mrs. Baker's absence, Mrs. Richard Wainwright, Mrs. George Odell, Mrs. John Jay White, Mrs. William S. Moore, Mrs. Samuel F. McCants, Mrs. William Thompson Burch, Mrs. Z. L. Tanner, Mrs. Nevil Monroe Hopkins and Miss Edith Goode.

The house committee has succeeded already in renting a large number of rooms in the house to permanent residents. A very charming restaurant under the management of Mrs. Florence Blake has been started on the main floor. Luncheon and dinner are served there as well as afternoon teas and after-theater suppers. The large parlors of the house will also be available to the public and are to be rented for meetings, teas, dances and other social affairs.

Mrs. William Kent, of California, has again assumed the chairmanship of the committee of one hundred, now enlarged to a committee of two hundred, which will provide for the maintenance and up-keep of these national headquarters. Already a number of names have been added to this committee. Among them are Mrs. John Winters Brannan, of New York; Mrs. A. H. Bright, Mrs. A. R. Colvin, Mrs. E. Dana Durand, Mrs. Alden H. Potter, of Minnesota; Mrs. Bertha Helm, Mrs. Nevil Monroe Hopkins, Miss Sheldon Jackson, Dr. Cora Smith King, Miss Eliza Lord, Mrs. Mary K. McCarty, Miss Helen Munroe, Mrs. Hazel Nyman, Mrs. George Rublee, Miss Eliza Tonks, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, Mrs. Helena Hill Weed, Mrs. Arthur Ramsay, and Mrs. Gilson Gardner, of Washington, D. C.; Mrs. George Hendrie and Mrs. George L. Sampson, of Michigan; Miss Caroline Katzenstein and Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, of Pennsylvania. Each member contributes twenty-five dollars to the work of the committee.

THE central department of the Congressional Union, the legislative, is in the hands of Miss Anne Martin, of Nevada. Miss Martin, with her inestimable experience of leading the campaign which made Nevada a free state, and with the advantage of addressing Congress as a voter, and a leader of voters, is particularly well fitted for the work she has consented to undertake for the Congressional Union. Miss Maud Younger and Miss Frances Jolliffe, of California, who are spending the winter in Washington, will assist Miss Martin. The services of trained workers from the enfranchised states will be a source of inestimable strength to the political work of the Union during the coming year.

Members of the legislative committee in the District are Mrs. George Odell, vice-chairman, Mrs. Gilson Gardner, Mrs. Lula Francis, Mrs. Minnie E. Brooke, Mrs. William Clagett, Miss Elsie Hill, Mrs. William Kent, Mrs. Nina E. Allender, and Miss Marion McCants.

Miss Martin has now begun the organization of a committee with a representative from every state in the Union, to increase the response from each state when a call is sent out for political action. Miss Sophonisba Breckinridge has accepted the position of member of the legislative committee for Illinois.

The treasurer's department will be as before, under the direction of Miss Joy Webster.

Miss Virginia Arnold, who took part in the election campaign of the Congressional Union in Oregon in 1914, and has since then worked in the middle west to build up an organization in Oregon and the northwestern states, will act during the coming months as research secretary in Washington.

THE SUFFRAGIST will be edited by Miss Lucy Burns; Mrs. William Thompson Burch, of Washington, D. C., acting as chairman of the circulation department, Mrs. Nina E. Allender, art editor, Miss Eiizabeth Smith, business manager, and Miss S. Ada Flatman, advertising manager.

Miss Elsie Hill

Who will organize in the western states

The press department will be under the management of Miss Margery Ross, who has had a wide experience in state campaigns. She was chairman during the past year of one of the counties in Pennsylvania.

THE work of completing the establishment of branches of the Congressional Union throughout the United States is in the hands of Miss Doris Stevens. Miss Stevens plans to build up as rapidly as possible a committee of suffrage workers in every Congressional district in the United States. There are four hundred and thirty-five Congressional districts. Effective and persistent work for the passage of the national suffrage amendment must be carried on in each one. Toward the building up of this organization a great deal of work has already been done. Since March, 1915, branches of the Congressional Union have been organized in twenty states: Maryland, Delaware, California, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maine, Virginia, South Carolina, Vermont, Connecticut, Oregon and Idaho.

Miss Mabel Vernon is now organizing a branch of the Congressional Union in Tennessee. Mrs. Ella Thompson is arranging a conference and convention in Houston, Texas. At both of these conventions Miss Alice Paul will be the chief speaker.

The District of Columbia, which has so important a work to do in carrying on a large part of the executive work at the national headquarters, in lobbying, and in the arrangement of demonstrations, was organized last year under Mrs. Nina E. Allender. Meetings are being held for the election of chairmen in every District precinct.

A number of organizers are in the field, working in various states. Miss Isabella Mott, who did such successful work in Newport and Ohio last year, will now go to Pennsylvania, where, in cooperation with Mrs. Harry Lowenburg, chairman, she will establish district committees in the Congressional districts of that state. Miss Emily Perry is carrying on the same work in Maryland, Miss Agnes Campbell in New Jersey, and Miss Clara Louise Rowe, in Delaware.

MEETINGS in the west are being arranged for Mrs. Sarah Bard Field, who is returning from New York to San Francisco in the week of January 17. A series of meetings have been arranged for Mrs. Field in Detroit, Dayton, Chicago, Milwaukee, Madison, Minneapolis and Colorado Springs. Mrs. Field, who brought the message of enfranchised women to the President of the United States, will have a thrilling story to tell, on her return, of the answer of the President to the deputation which waited upon him on the opening day of Congress, and of the hope of national enfranchisement for women through the power of the woman's vote in the west.

Miss Elsie Hill, one of the most brilliant workers and magnetic speakers in the Union, will also go to the Western states, leaving Washington on February 15, and will assist in the organization of the Congressional districts in the voting states.

The Union as a whole has one great duty before it—to establish an effective body of workers in every Congressional district so that a united demand may be made upon Congress in the present session for favorable action on the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

Work in the District of Columbia

AT the home of Mrs. Harvey Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C., on January 15, at five o'clock, there will be a meeting of the members of the Congressional Union who live in the tenth precinct of the District of Columbia. Mrs. Jessie Hardy MacKaye will speak on the subject of "Precinct Work in the District of Columbia." This is the third of a series of meetings arranged by the Congressional Union for the purpose of organizing the entire district by precincts. The purpose of this organization is to gain a larger membership, which may be called upon for demonstrations and for lobbying, and from which workers familiar with the political situation in Congress can be sent out to speak through the rest of the country. It is also the hope of the Congressional Union organizers that through these precinct organizations they may be able to increase the circulation of THE SUFFRAGIST, not only in the District of Columbia, but also throughout the country.

At the home of Mrs. George Odell, on January 9, a meeting was held, at which the eighth precinct was organized with the election of Mrs. Odell as chairman of the precinct; Miss Caroline Hoffman, secretary, and Miss Harriet Luhn, treasurer. Mrs. Nina E. Allender presided over the meeting, which was addressed by Mrs. Florence Kelley, of New York, and Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley.

On January 10, at the home of Miss Lucy MacKrille, a meeting was held to organize the seventh precinct. Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict explained the aims and plans of work of the Congerssional Union. Miss Mona Gill was elected chairman.

During the past month twelve street meetings have been held, at which the following Congressional Union workers have spoken: Miss Elsie Hill, Mrs. Ida May Waters, Mrs. Minnie E. Brooke, Miss Clara Louise Rowe, and Miss Helen Jollie.

Treasurer's Report

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS FROM JANUARY 1 THROUGH JANUARY 10, 1916.

Mrs. Paul Dessez	$25.00
Mrs. James Dean	1.00
Miss Aline Solomons	5.00
Miss Mabel Vernon	5.00
Mrs. F. R. Hazard	25.00
Mr. D. G. Pope	50.00
Mrs. Gilson Gardner	10.00
Miss Maude Jay Wilson	1.00
Miss Inez Fuller	5.00
Mrs. Eugene Shippen	5.00
Mrs. W. P. Rogers	7.00
Delaware Branch, Congressional Union	75.00
Miss Marie Ernst Kennedy	100.00
Mr. Bronson Cutting	18.00
Mrs. John Rogers	10.00
Miss Eliza Tonks	3.00
Miss Lavinia Dock	5.00
Mrs. George H. Day	60.00
Mrs. Donald R. Hooker	150.00
Miss F. Zeta Youmans	2.00
Miss Kate Matheson	1.00
Mrs. Charles Boughton Wood	1,000.00
Per Virginia Branch:	
Mrs. Charles Meredith	7.00
Mr. Thursby	2.00
Mrs. Percy Reed	1.00
Mrs. Kate G. Reed	5.00
Mrs. William Adams	3.00
Mrs. Hill Urquhart	4.00
Miss Edythe Hanzshe (collected)	7.95
Mrs. E. Longworth	2.50
Per Maryland Branch:	
Miss M. Soper (collected)	1.50
Miss F. Scott	5.00
Miss W. J. Brown	5.00
Miss Mary Bartlett Dixon	14.00
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis	13.00
Mrs. J. E. Nichol	6.60
Mrs. E. S. Latimer	25.00
Miss Mina Jackson	1.28
Collection	5.60
Per Colorado Branch:	
Mrs. Moina S. Rossignol	2.00
Dr. C. E. Spencer	4.00
Mrs. C. A. Eldridge	3.00
Mrs. H. M. Curtis	2.00
Mrs. W. C. Sturgis	12.00
Collection	3.07
Collection	.75
Membership fees	17.00
Total	$1,716.25
Previously acknowledged in THE SUFFRAGIST	102,170.99
Total collected through January 10, 1916	$103,887.24

The Federal Amendment

By Robert T. Whitehouse

(*Continued from page 6*)

the matters of municipal and state concern, but also for their presidential electors, senators and congressmen in whom is vested the power of declaring war or making peace; and surely the mothers of one state who in time of war give to the nation in the lives of their sons one of the greatest of human sacrifices, have a right to demand that the women and mothers of the other states should have a like choice with themselves in the selection of such representatives to Congress as shall declare their will in this matter of such vital national concern.

3. The changing conditions of the last century, the rapid extension of communication between the states by a network of railroads, steamboats, telegraph and telephone lines, and the resulting closer communication and interdependence of the several states, has necessarily brought about through the expansion of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution a remarkable extension of federal control, working for the greater efficiency and welfare of the nation, so that today no state can be said to "live wholly unto itself alone," but each is dependent upon its neighbor. Is it not under these conditions a matter of vital interest and deep concern to the women of one state that the women of all other states shall have a like voice with themselves in directing, through their representatives to Congress, the policy of the nation in reference to those matters in which their own state is affected by the conduct of citizens of neighboring states? Let us see if they are not thus deeply concerned.

(*a*) One of the most important enactments under the interstate commerce clause is the pure food act, which prohibits the introduction through interstate commerce into one state any impure food or adulterated drugs coming from another state. Are not the women as guardians of the home vitally interested that the women of all states shall have a voice in securing the uniform enforcement of this important federal law?

(*b*) There will be introduced at the coming session of Congress the so-called child labor federal amendment which will forbid the carrying in interstate commerce of any articles which are the product of child labor. Should not all the women of the states have a voice in the choice of Congressmen who are to determine the fate of this bill?

(*c*) In like manner are not the women vitally concerned in the enactment and enforcement of laws relating to employers' liability, the rights of widows and children of employes injured while employed in interstate commerce, in the hours of labor law, safety appliance act, and others that may be cited?

4. Under the new federal income tax law all women having an income of their own in excess of the exempted amount are obliged to pay a federal income tax. Unless they are permitted a voice as to the imposition of such a tax, its amount, and manner of collection, they are submitting to federal taxation without the right of direct representation.

5. There was presented to the last Congress and will be presented again a federal amendment prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors throughout the states. Has not the question of temperance, which of late has received such a world wide impetus in England, Russia and elsewhere, always been a matter of preeminent interest and concern to all the women of all the states? Should they not have a voice in choosing the men who are to represent their wishes in this matter?

6. One of the criticisms of our American civilization is the frequency of divorce and the lack of uniformity in the divorce laws of the several states. Such uniformity has long been sought by the American Bar Association in vain through legislation within the several states. Experience in this direction shows that this can only be obtained by a federal amendment; such an amendment was proposed in the session of 1884 and is likely to be offered again in the near future. Surely every woman is deeply concerned that the women of all the states should have some voice to prevent a state of things such as now exists whereby a husband in one state can, by a year's residence in another state, obtain a divorce there from his wife in the first state, for a cause not recognized in the latter, and yet leave her undivorced under the laws of her own state.

Nor is the apparent tendency to resort more frequently to amendment of the Constitution to meet the growing needs of the nation a matter to be regretted, when we consider that the chief criticism of our constitution has been its rigidity as compared with the more elastic character of the government of England.

WE submit, therefore, that the right of all citizens of our republic to exercise the franchise is not a matter purely of state concern, but is interwoven with the very fabric of our national welfare. In the main what is good for one state is good for another. If, as we contend, there are reasonable grounds to believe that the exercise of the franchise by women will tend to the creation of higher civic ideals and elevation of politics, afford better protection to women, not only in industry, but also in the home, and help develop in woman herself a broader outlook, deeper grasp, and higher sense of civic responsibility, then it is a matter of the deepest federal concern and the duty of every congressman, in view of the widespread and extended demand which unquestionably exists, to give all the states the opportunity of declaring in the manner provided by their constitution and in the most economical and effective way possible whether our country shall become in fact what it is now only in theory—a consistent democracy and a homogeneous nation.

5,000 New Subscribers

Members Who Have Secured New Subscribers for "The Suffragist"

(*In this column we list the subscriptions sent in each week by our members. These are only a part of the total number of new subscriptions.*)

JANUARY 2 THROUGH JANUARY 8

Mrs. George H. Day	2
Miss Pauline M. Floyd	2
Miss Helen Jollie	1
Mrs. Arthur Plum	1
Mrs. Florence Whitehouse	1
Mrs. Nina E. Allender	2
Miss Berry Pottier	1
Mrs. Alden H. Potter	1
Mrs. Caroline Barnes Wilson	1
Miss Lucy Burns	1
Mrs. Robert Adamson	1
Mrs. J. A. H. Hopkins	2
Mrs. Calvin Tomkins	3
Miss Marie E. Kennedy	1
Miss Grace Hillis	1
Miss Anna G. Swenson	1
Miss Frances Frothingham	1
Miss Charlotte Johnston	1
Total	24
Previously acknowledged in THE SUFFRAGIST	1,957
Total through January 8 secured by members	1,981

Telephone Main 673

Lanman Engraving Co.

HALF TONES, ZINC ETCHINGS
PROCESS ENGRAVERS
POST BUILDING Washington, D. C.

"THE BUSY CORNER"
S. Kann Sons & Co.
8TH ST. AND PENNA. AVE.
WASHINGTON, D. C.
Open 8.30 a. m. Close 5.30 p. m.
Saturday Close 6.00 p. m.

THEY ARE IN
Pictorial Review Company's Patterns and Free Sheets
FOR FEBRUARY

Get all the new ideas while they are fresh and new.

Pictorial Review Patterns present the new styles to you several months ahead of other patterns, and the February Free Sheets are interesting expositions of these advanced ideas.

Ask for one at the pattern counter.

Patterns 10c and 15c

Kann's—Street Floor.